

1
2
3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
4 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
5
6

7 MERRILL LYNCH, PIERCE, FENNER
8 & SMITH, INC.,

9 Plaintiff(s),

No. C 09-2256 PJH

10 v.

ORDER

11 KIA FRIEDMAN,

12 Defendant(s).
13 _____/

14 Before the court is plaintiff's proposed order on its motion for writ of attachment and
15 for temporary protective order, along with correspondence between the parties regarding
16 the contents of the order. As noted in the papers, the court denied plaintiff's motion for the
17 former, but granted its motion for the latter at the hearing on September 9, 2009. Because
18 the property sought to be attached or protected was not adequately identified in the motion
19 papers, the court directed the parties to prepare the order. It appears that the parties did
20 not meet and confer and prepare a joint proposed order and defendant's objections are not
21 entirely clear. Accordingly, if defendant believes another form of order is appropriate,
22 defendant shall file her own proposed order by Thursday September 17, 2009, and the
23 court will determine which is more appropriate. If no proposed order is filed by defendant,
24 the court will sign plaintiff's on September 18, 2009.

25 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

26 Dated: September 15, 2009



27 PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON
28 United States District Judge